

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DM 05-172

Respondent: Serge Laprise
Title: Manager – OSP Engineering

REQUEST: New Hampshire Utilities Commission Staff, Set 5 Follow-up

DATED: August 11, 2006

ITEM: Staff 5-8C Follow-Up Electrics & VZ – Given the paradigm shift in the joint pole ownership relationships that has been caused by the uncertainty that VZ will have a business relationship with a customer and therefore a reason to invest in a pole line extension for that customer, have the utilities attempted to change their JOA/IOPs to reflect that shift? If so, when and with what results?

REPLY: Contract language contained in the IOPs provides for the changing business paradigm in the telecommunications market with respect to the end-user customers’ ability to choose a provider other than Verizon NH, and, thus, the IOPs did not require modification as more competitors entered the New Hampshire telecommunications market.

VZ #289

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DM 05-172

Respondent: Martin Wilkinson
Title: Manager – OSP Engineering
Respondent: John Puopolo
Title: Director - Construction

REQUEST: New Hampshire Utilities Commission Staff, Set 5 Follow-up

DATED: August 11, 2006

ITEM: Staff 5-8G Follow-Up VZ – Please indicate the frequency with which construction schedules are reviewed. If schedules are reviewed less frequently than weekly, would the working relationships and communications with the other joint owner and customers improve if weekly scheduling course corrections or updates were made? Are there any barriers to implementing weekly scheduling reviews?

REPLY: Construction schedules are issued monthly and are reviewed and adjusted throughout the month to accommodate new or changing conditions. Discussions between the Scheduler and Foreman occur frequently throughout the month and adjustments are made when necessary.

VZ #293

**Verizon New England Inc.
d/b/a Verizon New Hampshire**

State of New Hampshire

Docket No. DM 05-172

Respondent: Troy McDonald

Title: Joint Lines Specialist – ME, VT, NH

REQUEST: New Hampshire Utilities Commission Staff, Set 5 Follow-up

DATED: August 11, 2006

ITEM: Staff 5-21A Unutil & VZ – Please detail your respective company positions on the
Follow-Up interpretation and use of IOP#2 1.D (1) & (2).

REPLY: IOP #2 1.D states that while the entire joint agreement is based on the responsibility of one party to set and maintain all poles within its given maintenance area, there may, from time to time, be situations described in 1.D(1) which would permit the non-maintaining party to place poles in the maintaining party's maintenance area. In accordance with its terms however, the principal of geographic maintenance areas is to be maintained.

IOP #2 1.D (1) permits the non-maintaining party to place a pole(s) in the maintaining party's maintenance area prior to the prescribed number of days provided for in other sections of the IOP. This section requires that the parties achieve mutual agreement of the need for the non-maintaining party to place the pole(s). This section requires that the parties must first mutually agree that a need exists for a non-maintaining party to set the pole. Among other circumstances, such conditions could exist when it is known that 1) Verizon NH will not be providing service to the customer in question; 2) Verizon NH does not foresee future pole requirements in the specified pole location(s); and 3) the power company needs to meet the customers' requested service date.

IOP #2 1.D (2) allows for a non-maintaining party to set poles in a co-owner's maintenance area as provided for in IOP #2 1.D(1), when the maintaining co-owner is unable to meet the other co-owners service needs. However, this provision does not negate other provisions of the overall IOP, which, for example, impose time frames for Exchange of Notice.

VZ #295